22. Software Problem Resolution Average Delay Days

Commitment Responsiveness

23. Percent on Time Response Commitments for Contracts, Business Rules and Telephone Calls

We will briefly discuss the merits of each of the 23 additional ALEC metrics proposed below.

A. Ordering

1. Call Abandonment Rate

At the hearing, Mpower witness Iacino testified that "Mpower experiences excessively long hold times when calling the LCSC." The ALEC Coalition further asserts that "Mpower testimony regarding long hold times may indicate a need for a call abandonment measurement to capture those calls where the ALEC gives up in frustration." BellSouth responds that the metrics "Speed of Answering in the Ordering Center and Average Answer Time-Repair Center measure the average time a customer is in queue when calling the ordering and repair center."

We agree with BellSouth and find that the Call Abandonment Rate metric would not be an effective measure because of the ability of the ALECs to affect the outcome by choosing to abandon the call. The record reflects that calls may be abandoned for a number of reasons, not all of which are under BellSouth's control. BellSouth should not be held responsible for metrics that do not reflect its performance. We find that the existing measure of Average Speed to Answer Calls is an adequate measure to address the ALECs concerns.

2. Percent Order Accuracy

ALEC witness Kinard states that this measure is needed in Florida "to ensure that BellSouth provisions an order the way it was entered or faxed by the ALEC." BellSouth witness Coon contends that BellSouth's existing measurements of Percent Provisioning Troubles within 30 days of Service Order Activity and Invoice Accuracy are reflective of the accuracy of BellSouth order

completions. We agree with the ALECs that this metric may provide useful information regarding the accuracy of orders.

B. Provisioning

3. Percent Successful xDSL Loops Cooperatively Tested

ALEC witness Kinard testifies that BellSouth should measure the percentage of successful xDSL loops cooperatively tested. Witness Kinard says this metric would capture how often an xDSL loop that is not working is delivered to the ALEC. BellSouth witness Coon stated that this measure is already captured through BellSouth's Measure P-7 Cooperative Acceptance Testing-Percent of xDSL Loops Tested. At the hearing, whether BellSouth's current metric was measuring only successful tests or measuring all tests conducted was debated. BellSouth witness Coon clarified that this measure was in fact the same as the measure the ALECs were requesting. BellSouth stated that it would be willing to make adjustments to its proposed SQMs to ensure that it was clear that the loop had to be successful from both the ALEC and the ILEC points of view. We find such clarification necessary. Accordingly, the following changes shall be made: (1) In the Definition Portion, the following sentence shall be added "A loop will be considered successfully cooperatively tested when both the ALEC and ILEC representatives agree that the loop has passed the cooperative testing"; and (2) In the SEEM Analog/Benchmark, the phrase "95 percent of Lines Tested" shall be replaced with "95 percent of Lines Tested Successfully Passing Cooperative Testing."

4. Percent Completion/Attempts Without a Notice or With Less Than 24 Hours Notice

Witness Kinard argues that "[m]issed or late confirmations make ALECs look disorganized since they have to scramble to meet the due date or are caught off guard by service delivery to their customer." BellSouth witness Coon states that while this metric was approved in Georgia, it does not capture any information about the level of service BellSouth provides to the ALEC. Witness Coon argues that BellSouth has "five separate provisioning measurements (Provisioning P1-P5) that deal with order completion interval, held orders and completion notices." BellSouth believes that this measure would penalize BellSouth when the ALEC asked for an expedited installation of less than three days (which resulted in

the manual handling of the order) and when BellSouth took 48 hours to return the FOC to the ALEC. In this situation, the FOC would have been returned in the allowed time and the order would have been worked on the exact date requested by the ALEC. However, because less than 24 hours separated the FOC and the time the order was worked, a penalty would be charged.

We are not convinced by BellSouth's argument and find that this measure shall be included. An exclusion for expedited orders can be included in the Business Rules to alleviate BellSouth's concern.

5. *Percent of Orders Canceled or Supplemented at the Request of the ILEC*

ALEC witness Kinard states that this metric, which was adopted in New York, captures instances when ALECs do not extend the due date voluntarily but rather at the request of BellSouth in order to adjust for BellSouth-caused failures to complete the order. "When an ALEC agrees to supplement the order at BellSouth's request, what would have been a missed due date is now assigned a new due date in the future." BellSouth witness Coon testified that "the focus of BellSouth's activities is on complying with meeting the due dates on the original order, not on asking the ALEC to supplement or cancel the order." Witness Coon continued that this measurement is not necessary because if BellSouth did ask for a supplementary order, it "could and in no doubt would have a bona fide reason for asking for a supplementary order."

We find that justifiable reasons for requesting supplements may exist and that these requests may be in the best interest of the ALEC. Therefore, we find that this metric is not appropriate at this time. However, our staff will review the reasons for cancellation and the need for this metric during the six month review.

6. *Percent Customers Restored to ILEC*
7. *Mean Time to Restore Customer to the ILEC*

ALEC witness Kinard states that these two metrics are necessary because they measure both "the speed of restoring service to BellSouth when a customer conversion fails and the percent of accurate port-backs to BellSouth when necessary." BellSouth

witness Coon argues that these measures relate to customers who were going to be switched to the ALECs but who were not because of a problem in the porting process. Witness Coon states that "[t]he measures would record the time that lapsed before the customer is returned to service with BellSouth and the percentage of customers that are returned" for these reasons. Witness Coon states that it would be impossible to draw any meaningful conclusions from these measurements. According to witness Coon, the porting may fail because of something the ALEC did or failed to do, furthermore, there are existing measures in place to quantify problems in the "hot cut" process. These existing measures include Coordinated Customer Conversions-Average Recovery Time and Hot Cut Timeliness.

We find these two proposed measures, Percent Customer Restored to ILEC and Mean Time to Restore Customer to the ILEC would not provide meaningful data since the porting problems may occur as a result of an ALEC action. As a result, these metrics shall not be adopted at this time.

8. Percent Completion of Timely Loop Modification

ALEC witness Kinard affirms that some loops require modification or conditioning before they can be used to provide a customer with xDSL service. According to witness Kinard, this metric measures BellSouth's timeliness in making needed modifications or performing the necessary deconditioning. Covad witness Allen emphasizes the need for a metric or a level of disaggregation for loop provisioning where conditioning is required. Witness Coon asserts that BellSouth has added DSL level disaggregation to its existing and new measures. Witness Coon believes that the process for handling orders with loop conditioning was being modified so that this measurement is addressed by BellSouth provisioning measurements, such as Order Completion Interval and Percent Missed Installation Appointments. At the hearing, witness Coon could not give a firm date as to when the process would be modified.

We agree that BellSouth has adequate disaggregation in the Order Completion Interval metric to address the ALEC concerns. However, the Missed Installation Appointments Interval does not contain this same level of disaggregation for orders with and without conditioning. We find this disaggregation useful. As an alternative to the disaggregation for loop conditioning for Percent

Missed Installation Appointments, BellSouth shall establish a separate measurement for loop conditioning.

9. Percent of Hot Cuts Not Working as Initially Provisioned

ALEC witness Kinard asserts that this measure captures instances when loops are provisioned on time but are not working. According to witness Kinard, often ALECs cannot log a trouble report until the order is completed in the ILEC's billing system, which may take may hours or days. Witness Kinard contends that these provisioning troubles are undetectable by BellSouth's current performance measures. Witness Coon's response is that BellSouth is adding a new hot cut measurement, Percent Troubles within 7 Days of a Completed Service Order. Witness Coon says that an ALEC can report a trouble as soon as the service order is completed--they do not have to wait until the order is completed in the ILEC billing system.

Upon consideration, we find that the measure proposed by the ALECs would be redundant to the Percent Troubles Within 7 days of a Completed Service Order metric.

10. Percent On-Time Hot Cut Performance

According to witness Kinard, customers must not be subjected to unscheduled service disruptions because of lengthy or uncoordinated cut overs of loops. An early cut of facilities can cause the customer to lose service, and a late cut translation often means the customer cannot receive all calls or certain incoming calls. Either is harmful to customers and to the ALECs' reputations.

Although BellSouth has proposed a similar measure, under its proposal, BellSouth is considered to have met its metric if the cut over starts within 15 minutes of the scheduled start time. Under the ALEC Coalition's proposal, BellSouth is measured by whether it is started and completed within the specific cut over window. Upon consideration, we find that this metric is adequately covered by the BellSouth metrics Coordinated Customer Conversion Hot Cut Timeliness and the Coordinated Customer Conversion Interval.

C. Maintenance & Repair

11. Mean Jeopardy Interval for Maintenance & Trouble Handling

Witness Kinard asserts that this measure is similar to the metric for jeopardies in provisioning. If BellSouth makes an appointment to repair a service and then finds it cannot make that appointment, the ALEC should be given a notice. Witness Kinard states that the notice would provide the ALEC an opportunity to contact its customers in order to reschedule the appointment and to minimize inconvenience. BellSouth witness Coon's testimony does not address the merits of this metric.

We find that sufficient notification of repair status changes, including possible jeopardies, are available to ALECs through TAFI and ECTA repair interfaces and the CWINS Center. TAFI and ECTA provide electronic notification of recent status changes and intermediate status codes to describe repair activities and problems encountered. Manual repair status reports are also available by calling the CWINS center. Conditions jeopardizing repair completion, such as missed repair appointments, no access to customer premises, modifications to pending reports, and no available facilities can be individually monitored by ALECs in current repair metrics, or through updated status reports and intermediate status codes. As a result, we find that this metric is unnecessary at this time.

D. Billing

12. Percent Billing Errors Corrected in X Days

Witness Kinard testified at hearing that delays in providing adjustments to carrier bills or correct daily usage feed errors can harm the ALEC and its customers. Errors that do not get corrected promptly either lead to the ALECs holding up charges or passing on the wrong charges to the customer. Witness Kinard contends that the current invoice accuracy measure does not capture whether errors are corrected within a reasonable time. BellSouth witness Coon states that BellSouth currently provides measurements that address this issue in the B-1 Invoice Accuracy metric. In addition, BellSouth conducts monthly audits by the Billing Verification Group that evaluate samples of bills for accuracy and

compliance. BellSouth believes that the measures provide adequate information to assess BellSouth's billing processes.

We find that this proposed metric would capture how quickly BellSouth corrects errors. While there are existing measures to capture billing timeliness and billing accuracy, none of the measures capture how quickly errors are fixed. We agree that this metric shall be added.

13. Percent on Time Mechanized Invoice Delivery

ALEC witness Kinard states that "[n]ot only do the charges on the bills need to be correct and complete, but also that the formatting must follow appropriate industry standards for electronic processing in the ALECs' systems. Without properly mechanized bills, ALECs may be forced to reconcile boxes of paper bills for charges that cannot be accepted or audited by their electronic systems." BellSouth witness Coon states that BellSouth's Mean Time to Deliver Invoices metric addresses this issue.

We agree with BellSouth that the Mean Time to Deliver Invoices metric proposed by BellSouth captures the intent of the metric proposed by the ALECs. We find both metrics unnecessary. The metric proposed by BellSouth is adequate. If ALECs would like to propose replacing the BellSouth metric with the ALEC proposed metric, this could be considered during the six-month review period. We find that the Mean Time to Deliver Invoices metric is more useful for parity evaluation purposes.

E. Trunk Group Performance

14. Timeliness of Response for BST to CLEC Trunks
15. Percent Response to Requests for BST to ALEC Trunks Provided within 7 Days
16. Percent Negative Responses to Requests for BST to ALEC Trunks

Witness Kinard states in her direct testimony that "ALECs cannot expand without adequate trunk capacity inbound from the ILEC as well as outbound to the ILEC. ILEC delays in providing reciprocal trunks or delays in providing ALECs a due date for such trunks force ALECs to delay installing new customers." According to witness Kinard, the "Mean Time to Provide Response measurement

is key when comparing service to affiliates in response to trunk requests. The Percent Responses to Requests for BellSouth-to-ALEC Trunks Provided Within 7 Days metric measures the response standard proposed by ALECs to be achieved 95 percent of the time. The Percent Negative Response to Request for BellSouth-to-ALEC trunks metric would allow tracking of BellSouth rejections of ALEC requests for more capacity."

BellSouth witness Coon contends that "[t]he primary focus of these measurements is to determine whether there is sufficient trunking capacity from the BellSouth network to the ALEC switch when traffic is increased substantially, such as might occur when an Internet Service Provider is switched to the ALEC. Each of these measures purports to measure responses to requests by ALECs for trunking. Since BellSouth has no way of knowing when this is going to occur, it hardly seems fair to have a measurement related to BellSouth success in meeting unanticipated demand." Witness Coon suggests that "[t]he best solution is not to have another set of metrics but to require accurate forecasts by the ALECs of traffic requirements."

We find these metrics unnecessary at this time because the record shows that the number of trunk requests by ALECs on a monthly basis is extremely low. ALECs should be responsible for actively monitoring their requests and following up on a case-by-case basis.

F. BFR Process

17. *Percentage of Requests Processed within 30 Business Days*
18. *Percentage of Quotes Provided for Authorized BFRs/Special Requests within X (30, 60, 90) Days*

The Georgia Commission ordered BellSouth to add measurements to the SQMs reflecting both the percentage of Bona Fide Request (BFRs) processed within thirty days and the percentage of quotes provided for Bona Fide Requests within certain intervals. Witness Kinard states that these measures should be included in the Florida metrics since they were ordered in Georgia. "While BellSouth could report its performance with respect to Bona Fide Requests on a manual basis," according to witness Coon, he believes "it is impossible to draw any conclusions about BellSouth's performance based upon a limited number of transactions." "[D]uring the period

of January 2000 through October 2000, BellSouth received only seven BFRs from ALECs across the entire region." We agree with BellSouth and find these two metrics unnecessary. Additionally, witness Kinard agreed that these metrics could wait for a later date for implementation of this measure. We find these two metrics provide limited information and shall not be captured.

G. Change Management

19. ILEC vs CLEC Changes Made

Witness Kinard states that this measure is necessary because "BellSouth has not yet included a metric in its SQM that tracks whether BellSouth responds fairly to ALEC requests for changes and new functionalities on its interfaces." Witness Kinard testified that "[w]hile ALECs prioritize the change requests, BellSouth implements these changes whenever it chooses and ignores the ALEC prioritization. Therefore, according to witness Kinard, "the Commission needs to order BellSouth to measure the percentage of BellSouth changes made versus the number of ALEC changes made to determine whether ALEC requests are being handled in a fair and equitable manner." BellSouth witness Coon testified that this measure would not prove useful. Witness Coon states that the "change control process has a method of escalating any disputes about whether a proposed change was property rejected." According to witness Coon, the measurement would tell us nothing about the relative merits or demerits of any proposal.

We agree with this assertion. BellSouth could be penalized for making changes when they are in the best interest of the ALEC. Because of the potential disincentive of this metric, this metric shall not be adopted.

H. Software Issues

20. Percent Software Certification Failures
21. Software Problem Resolution Timeliness
22. Software Problem Resolution Average Delay Days

ALEC witness Kinard believes that the metric *Percent Software Certification Failures* will provide ALECs with "some assurance that BellSouth will sufficiently test software before a system is rolled out. ALECs need to be sure that their existing systems will still

function when BellSouth introduces software upgrades." According to witness Kinard, the other two software metrics measure how quickly BellSouth fixes software errors caused by changes to an existing interface. The Average Delay Day measure captures the degree to which the problem is allowed to continue. Witness Kinard states that the Georgia, Texas and New York plans have such a metric. BellSouth witness Coon believes that the testing arrangements made available with any software update are adequate to resolve these issues before the software is loaded. Witness Coon continues that "the change management process is more suitable for establishing methods and procedures for software updates."

We find that none of these three metrics are necessary at this time. BellSouth's business processes currently include software testing. The purpose of testing is to find and correct errors. We find that BellSouth shall not be penalized for errors found in testing. We find no valid reason for monitoring these numbers. We have not seen any evidence presented in this case that software problem resolution is an issue with BellSouth's performance that would necessitate the need for metrics.

I. Commitment Responsiveness

23. Percent on Time Response Commitments for Contracts, Business Rules and Telephone Calls

ALEC witness Kinard believes that this metric will capture how quickly BellSouth representatives resolve problems. According to witness Kinard, an ALEC "should not have to wait days for BellSouth to respond to a problem that has stalled production of orders for the ALEC." BellSouth witness Coon argues that "this measure would be dependent upon a completely manual process of tracking the responsiveness of BellSouth service representatives." We agree that this measure would be labor intensive to capture and because of the imprecise collecting results, this metric shall not be adopted at this time.

Attachment 3 to this Order, which is attached and incorporated in this Order by reference, delineates a summary of which metrics are proposed by BellSouth, which are proposed by the ALECs and which are approved by this Commission.

All 71 proposed BellSouth metrics shall be adopted as part of the Florida SQMs. Additionally, the following four metrics shall be included in the Florida SQMs:

Percent Order Accuracy
Percent Completion/Attempts without a Notice or with less than 24 Hours Notice
Percent Completion of Timely Loop Modification
Percent Billing Errors Corrected in X Days

ATTACHMENT 1

Number of Proposed Metrics by Category		
OSS Category	**BellSouth**	**ALECs**
Preordering	6	6
Ordering	15	17
Provisioning	15	23
Maintenance & Repair	7	8
Billing	8	10
OS/DA	4	4
Database Update	3	3
E911	3	3
Trunk Group Performance	2	5
Collocation	3	3
Change Management/Interface Outages	5	6
Software Issues	0	3
BFR Process	0	2
Commitment Responsiveness	0	1
Totals	71	94

ATTACHMENT 2

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED SQMS				
	Measure	**BST-FL Proposed**	**ALEC Proposed**	**Commission Approved**
	Preordering			
OSS-2	OSS Interface Availability (Preordering/Ordering)	X	X	X
OSS-1	Average Response Time for OSS Preorder Interfaces & Response Interval	X	X	X
OSS-3	Interface Availability (M&R)	X	X	X
OSS-4	Response Interval (M&R)	X	X	X
PO-1	Loop Makeup Inquiry (Manual)	X	X	X
PO-2	Loop Makeup Inquiry (Electronic: TAG and LENS)	X	X	X
	Ordering			
O-1	Acknowledgment Timeliness (Electronic)	X	X	X
O-2	Acknowledgment Completeness (Fully Mechanized, Partially Mechanized & Total Mechanized)	X	X	X
O-3	Percent Order Flow Through (Summary)	X	X	X
O-4	Percent Order Flow Through (Detail)	X	X	X
O-5	Flow-through Error Analysis	X	X	X
O-6	CLEC LSR Information - LSR Flow-Through Matrix	X	X	X
O-7	Percent Rejected Service Request (Mechanized, Partially Mechanized & Non-Mechanized)	X	X	X
O-8	Reject Interval	X	X	X
O-9	Firm Order Confirmation Timeliness (Mechanized, Partially Mechanized & Non-Mechanized)	X	X	X
O-10	Service Inquiry with LSR Firm Order Confirmation (FOC) Response Time (Manual)	X	X	X
O-11	Firm Order Confirmation and Reject Response Completeness	X	X	X
O-12	Speed of Answer in Ordering Center	X	X	X
O-13	LNP - Percent Rejected Service Request	X	X	X

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED SQMS				
	Measure	**BST-FL Proposed**	**ALEC Proposed**	**Commission Approved**
O-14	LNP - Reject Interval Distribution & Average Reject Interval	X	X	X
O-15	LNP - FOC Timeliness Interval Distribution & FOC Average Interval	X	X	X
	Call Abandonment Rate		X	
	Percent Order Accuracy		X	X
	Provisioning			
P-1	Mean Held Order Interval	X	X	X
P-2	Percent Orders given Jeopardy Notice (Electronic)	X	X	X
P-2	Average Jeopardy Notice Interval (Electronic)	X	X	X
P-3	Percent Missed Installation Appointments	X	X	X
P-4	Order Completion Interval	X	X	X
P-5	Average Completion Notice Interval (Electronic)	X	X	X
P-6	Coordinated Customer Conversions Interval	X	X	X
P-6A	Coordinated Customer Conversions Hot Cut Timeliness % within Interval & Average Interval	X	X	X
P-6B	Coordinated Customer Conversions - Average Recovery Time	X	X	X
P-6C	Coordinated Customer Conversions - % Provisioning Troubles Received Within 7 Days of a Completed Service Order	X	X	X
P-7	Cooperative Acceptance Testing(% xDSL Loops Tested)	X	X	X
P-8	% Provisioning Troubles within 30 days	X	X	X
P-9	Total Service Order Cycle Time	X	X	X
P-10	LNP - Percent Missed Installation Appointments	X	X	X
P-11	LNP - Average Disconnect Timeliness Interval & Disconnect Timeliness Interval Distribution	X	X	X
P-12	LNP - TSOCT	X	X	X

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED SQMS				
	Measure	**BST-FL Proposed**	**ALEC Proposed**	**Commission Approved**
	% Completions/Attempts w/o notice or w/Less Than 24 Hr Notice		X	X
	Percent of Orders Canceled or Supplemented at Request of ILEC		X	
	% Customer Restored to ILEC		X	
	% Completion of Timely Loop Modification		X	X
	Mean Time to Restore Customer to the ILEC		X	
	Percent of Hot Cuts Not Working as Initially Provisioned		X	
	xDSL Successfully Tested		X	
	Maintenance & Repair			
M&R-1	Missed Repair Appointments	X	X	X
M&R-2	Customer Trouble Report Rate	X	X	X
M&R-3	Maintenance Average Duration	X	X	X
M&R-4	% Repeat Troubles within 30 days	X	X	X
M&R-5	Out of Service > 24 hours	X	X	X
M&R-6	Average Answer Time - Repair Center	X	X	X
M&R-7	Mean Time to Notify CLEC of Network Outages (M&R)	X	X	X
	Mean Jeopardy Interval for Maintenance & Trouble Handling		X	
	Billing			
B-1	Invoice Accuracy	X	X	X
B-2	Mean Time to Deliver Invoices	X	X	X
B-3	Usage Data Delivery Accuracy	X	X	X
B-4	Usage Data Delivery Completeness	X	X	X
B-5	Usage Data Delivery Timeliness	X	X	X
B-6	Mean Time to Deliver Usage	X	X	X
B-7	Recurring Charge Completeness	X	X	X

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED SQMS				
	Measure	**BST-FL Proposed**	**ALEC Proposed**	**Commission Approved**
B-8	Non-Recurring Charge Completeness	X	X	X
	% Billing Errors Corrected in X Days		X	X
	% on Time Mechanized Invoice Delivery		X	
	OS/DA			
OS-1	Average Speed to Answer (OS)	X	X	X
OS-2	% Answered in "X" Seconds (OS)	X	X	X
DA-1	Average Speed to Answer (DA)	X	X	X
DA-2	% Answered in "X" Seconds (DA)	X	X	X
D-1	Average Update Interval for DA Database for Facility Based CLECs	X	X	X
D-2	Percentage DA Database Accuracy For Manual Updates	X	X	X
D-3	Percent NXXs loaded and Tested by/or prior to the LERG effective date	X	X	X
E-1	Timeliness	X	X	X
E-2	Accuracy	X	X	X
E-3	Mean Interval	X	X	X
	Commitment Responsiveness			
	% on Time Response Commitments for Contracts, Business Rules and Telephone Calls		X	
	Trunk Group Performance			
TGP-1	Trunk Group Performance - Aggregate	X	X	X
TGP-2	Trunk Group Performance - Specific	X	X	X
	Timeliness of Response for BST to CLEC Trunks		X	
	% Responses to Requests for BST to ALEC Trunks Provided within 7 Days		X	

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED SQMS				
	Measure	**BST-FL Proposed**	**ALEC Proposed**	**Commission Approved**
	% Negative Responses to Requests for BST to ALEC Trunks		X	
	Collocation			
C-1	Average Response Time	X	X	X
C-2	Average Arrangement Time	X	X	X
C-3	% of Due Dates Missed	X	X	X
	Bona Fide/Special Request Process (BFRs)			
	Percentage of Requests Processed within 30 Business Days		X	
	Percentage of Quotes Provided for Authorized BFRs/Special Requests Within X (10,30,90) Days		X	
	Change Management/Interface Outages			
CM-1	Timeliness of Change Management Notices	X	X	X
CM-2	Average Delay Days for Change Management Notices	X	X	X
CM-3	Timeliness of Documents Associated with Change	X	X	X
CM-4	Average Delay Days for Documentation	X	X	X
CM-5	Average Notice of Interface Outage	X	X	X
	ILEC vs CLEC Changes Made		X	
	Software Issues			
	Software Problem Resolution Timeliness		X	
	% Software Certification Failures		X	
	Software Problem Resolution Average Delay Days		X	
TOTAL		**71**	**94**	**75**

IV. BUSINESS RULES, EXCLUSIONS, CALCULATIONS, AND LEVELS OF DISAGGREGATION AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

In this Section, we address the specific business rules, calculations, disaggregation and standards for the metrics that will be used to ascertain whether BellSouth is providing Operation Support System service at parity. Each of the metrics must be documented in detail so that it is clear what is being measured, how it is being measured and what is excluded from the measurement. Sufficient metric disaggregation is necessary so that like-to-like comparison can be made. Additionally, a performance standard in the form of a benchmark or an analog must also be identified.

Arguments

BellSouth and the ALECs both frame this issue around two distinct questions. The first involves the appropriate business rules, exclusions, calculations and standards for each measurement. The second, much larger, issue has to do with the level of disaggregation that should be included in the plan. Generally when we use the term business rules for purposes of this Order, we are including business rules, exclusions and calculations in one category. The arguments presented below will therefore address three areas: business rules, disaggregation and standards.

BellSouth's Exhibit 16 presents BellSouth's recommendation as to appropriate business rules, exclusions, calculations, levels of disaggregation and performance standards for each measurement. The BellSouth recommendations are included in the BellSouth Service Quality Measurement (SQM) Plan. The ALEC Exhibit 14 presents the ALEC Coalition's recommendation pertaining to business rule changes, levels of disaggregation and performance standards.

A. Business Rules

ALEC witness Kinard asserts that "business rules are the heart of every measure. The Business rules state the start and stop time of each metric and provide details necessary to describe processes in between. The rules on how the data will be collected for ALECs and for BellSouth are also included. Witness Kinard states that "the business rules need to be detailed enough that a third party can use them to recreate BellSouth's performance measure reports using BellSouth's raw data. According to witness Kinard, "[t]hey

also must be structured to ensure that BellSouth discrimination is not being masked." Composite Exhibit 14, KK-1 describes over 120 individual issues or disputes the ALEC Coalition has with BellSouth's SQMs.

Witness Coon claims that witness Kinard's analysis is based on an older SQM plan than what was filed in Florida and that the version of the SQM filed in this docket address a number of witness Kinard's concerns. As for other comments, to the extent they are still relevant to the current SQM plan, witness Coon states that the BellSouth Business rules are clear, concise and appropriate.

Witness Coon argues that the changes advocated by witness Kinard "are similar to changes that BellSouth and a coalition of ALECs discussed extensively in the generic performance measurement dockets in Louisiana and Georgia for the past two years. Many of the ALECs participating in those dockets are the same ALECs involved in this generic proceeding in Florida." Witness Coon states that Kinard is "simply rehashing old issues and offering no substantive reason why BellSouth business rules should be changed."

B. Disaggregation

In its brief, BellSouth suggests that "[t]he issue of the appropriate level of disaggregation is, with the possible exception of penalty amounts and the system to apply penalties, the single issue of greatest practical importance to this docket. In principle, both parties agree that the measurement categories should be broken down to a level so that there are meaningful direct comparisons between the performance BellSouth gives its customers and that provided to ALECs and their customers."

"BellSouth proposed measurements are disaggregated into 1200 submetrics, according to a methodology that is described in detail in DAC-4." "BellSouth believes that the level of disaggregation it proposes (which is comparable to what was adopted in Georgia and Louisiana) is more than adequate to make meaningful comparisons for the purpose of determining whether BellSouth is providing service at parity."

In his testimony, witness Coon gave a specific example of how the "overzealous disaggregation" proposed by the ALECs would affect one particular measure, Mean Held Order and Distribution Interval.

The ALECs proposed that this category be disaggregated by 41 types of products, 13 levels of geography, three levels of volume, and three levels of dispatch status. Thus, to determine the number of submeasures that would result from the disaggregation proposed by the ALECs, one would have to multiply 41 times 13 times three times three, for a total of 4,797 submeasures for the single measurement of Mean Held Order and Distribution Interval. Much time was spent in depositions and the hearing attempting to ascertain the number of submetrics the ALECs are proposing. Witness Bursh states in her deposition that she had calculated the number of submetrics and concluded there are exactly 10,000. At the time of the hearing, however, she admitted that her analysis was wrong, and the ALECs stipulated to this effect. Witness Coon attempted to estimate the number of submetrics in the ALEC proposal and he estimated there would be approximately 75,000. Witness Kinard readily admitted she had no idea how many submetrics there are in the ALEC plan.

The ALEC Coalition proposes that this Commission require BellSouth to provide a level of disaggregation such that deficiencies in BellSouth's performance can neither be masked nor ignored. Disaggregation should be required by geography, interface type, preorder query type, product, service order activity, volume category, trouble type, trunk design and type (for trunk blockage measurements), maintenance and repair query type and collocation category. Not every disaggregation category would apply to every measurement in the ALEC proposal, but many (if not most) measurements would have multiple types of disaggregation applied to them. Composite Exhibit 14, KK-2 provided in depth details regarding the levels of disaggregation proposed by the ALECs.

According to the ALECs, "aggregating multiple product offerings together, particularly offerings that have different standards, provides an inaccurate view of BellSouth's performance. BellSouth's poor performance on some measurements would be masked due to aggregation with other measures that show adequate performance."

According to witness Kinard, the levels of disaggregation should cover all of the products ALECs purchase when there is large-scale entry in both the residential and business markets, including the popular xDSL services. Witness Kinard states that to be effective in measuring BellSouth's performance, the reporting should categorize the information by product type to identify with

specificity the services provided by BellSouth. Examples of product disaggregation include resale, UNEs and trunks broken down by residential and business customer where appropriate. Further disaggregation for resale and UNEs include DS1s and DS3s, separating BRI ISDN from PRI ISDN. Unbundled loop types, such as analog voice-grade loops, digital loops, ADSL loops, HDSL loops, UCLs, and xDSL loops should be disaggregated because BellSouth's performance will vary for each loop type. Also, UNE-Platform needs to be reported separately because this product combines a loop with switching and transport and is different than just ordering a loop without the switching and transport.

The ALEC Coalition rebuttal testimony highlighted additional areas of concern regarding BellSouth's proposed disaggregation levels. According to witness Kinard, provisioning and repair measures should be divided into three categories: 1) switched-based orders; 2) central office or "dispatch in" orders; and 3) field work or "dispatch out" orders. According to witness Kinard, other key examples of BellSouth's inappropriate loop disaggregation include the following items. First, DS1 loops should not be included with DS3 loops because BellSouth has different intervals for DS1 and DS3 loops. Second, various types of xDSL services should be disaggregated to detect discrimination in the ALECs' chosen mode of service delivery of problems in checking facilities for certain types of DSL products. Third, line splitting should be disaggregated from line sharing in order to detect discrimination when the ILEC is not the voice provider of the loop.

Testimony from e.spire shows "that disaggregated reporting for Special Access to Enhanced Extended Loop conversions are required for the ordering and provisioning metrics to capture problems it has run into in migrating between the two BellSouth services." Although e.spire submitted data to BellSouth nearly one year ago, BellSouth has not processed e.spire's orders. According to e.spire, "[t]his delay runs counter to the FCC's recognition that 'the process by which special access circuits are converted to unbundled loop-transport combinations should be simple and accomplished without delay.'" citing Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket 96-98, Supplemental Order on Clarification, 15, FCC Rcd 9578 para.30.

According to BellSouth,

> [i]f the impossibility of the ALEC plan were not enough reason to reject it, there is also the fact that it is conceptually flawed. There is no question but that more disaggregation will result in smaller numbers of events that are captured in each submeasure. Both Ms.Kinard and Ms. Bursh testified that for many of the submeasurement categories proposed by the ALECs there would be no activity in a given month. Likewise, witness Kinard admitted that even when there is activity, some submetrics would likely capture as few as one, two, or three events. As Dr. Ford, a witness for Z-Tel, testified, generally speaking, smaller sample sizes result in a lower level of statistical confidence in any test performed on the samples. In other words (as Dr .Ford also admitted), the smaller the sample size, the less sure one can be from a statistical standpoint that the occurrence of a particular event is attributable to something other than random chance. Thus, more disaggregation would result in smaller samples, which as a general proposition, would raise the possibility that BellSouth is being adjudged as providing service at something less than parity, when any observed disparity is actually nothing more than a random occurrence.

According to BellSouth's brief, "BellSouth has proposed a reasonable plan that is calculated to accomplish the task that performance measurement plans are supposed to do, detect discriminatory performance." According to BellSouth, the ALEC plan "is impossible to implement, impossible to monitor and calculated only to prevent BellSouth from obtaining interLATA relief in Florida."

Standards

Witness Kinard testified that

> a retail analog is a service or function that BellSouth provides for itself, its customers or its affiliates that is analogous to a service or function that BellSouth provides to ALECs. When a BellSouth retail analog exists, BellSouth performance for itself, its customers and its affiliates should be compared to its performance

> for ALECs to determine if BellSouth is meeting the Act's parity requirement. If no retail analog exists, BellSouth's performance must be gauged by a performance standard, also known as a benchmark. A benchmark is a set level of performance, such as provisioning a particular UNE 95 percent of the time within three days.
>
> According to witness Kinard:
>
> Benchmarks should be based on the level of performance that can be expected to offer an efficient carrier a meaningful opportunity to compete. Benchmarks cannot be based simply on BellSouth's historical performance - [because] BellSouth has provided a certain level of service to ALECs in the past does not mean that level of service provides ALECs a meaningful opportunity to compete or to even meet Florida's end user standards.
>
> Choosing a retail analog that is dissimilar to the service or product being measured can make discriminatory performance look like parity. If a slow process is chosen on the retail side, it masks poor performance on the wholesale side.

The benchmarks and analogs proposed by witness Kinard were included in testimony. The ALEC Coalition takes issue with those BellSouth proposed benchmarks that are below the 95 percent or higher thresholds that have been set in other states, such as New York and Texas, for most metrics except for call center and OSDA answer times. Often, the intervals themselves are set below those adopted in other states. According to the ALEC Coalition, this Commission should require BellSouth to meet the 95 percent or higher thresholds to foster competition as was done in New York and Texas.

> In its brief, the ALECs state:
>
> In some instances, BellSouth has proposed measures without retail analogs or benchmarks, in what it terms "diagnostic." For some measures, ALECs do not disagree, but for some, the ALECs believe the Commission should establish a benchmark. For example, BellSouth has proposed the metric O-12, Speed of Answer in the Ordering

Center, which measures the average time an ALEC is in queue at the Local Carrier Service Center (LCSC), sometimes with customers on the line. Because BellSouth has decided to label it "diagnostic" there is no performance standard that BellSouth is held accountable for meeting. Mpower testified that it generally experiences excessively long hold times when calling into the LCSC trying to clarify the BellSouth business rules it is required to follow. Often Mpower is put on hold when it calls the LCSC from 20 minutes to over 90 minutes. There is no reason for this metric to be diagnostic: the Commission should adopt the ALECs' proposed benchmark of 95 percent in 20 seconds and 100 percent in 30 seconds.

Furthermore, with respect to benchmarks for xDSL loop delivery, BellSouth has proposed that it be given seven business days from issuance of the FOC (for loops without conditioning) and 14 business days from issuance of the FOC (for loops with conditioning).

In their brief, the ALECs contend that BellSouth's measurement will not capture its performance of conditioning at all.

For loops without conditioning, BellSouth is actually asking for two days longer to deliver a loop than it promises in its product and services guide. BellSouth performance will improve only when this Commission orders that performance to improve. For example, Mr. Latham admitted that BellSouth only began offering to perform conditioning in 14 days after the Georgia Commission ordered that benchmark. Mr. Latham admitted that BellSouth could deliver a loop in five days, but had never tried to deliver one in three days, although it was technically feasible to do so. Moreover, Mr. Latham testified that he was not aware that BellSouth was proposing seven business day for the provisioning plus 48 hours for issuance of a FOC, for a total interval of nine business days. BellSouth fails to justify this excessive interval, while admitting it can provision loops in a shorter period and that it should be working to improve loop delivery intervals.

The ALECs believe that "[n]o improvement will happen until the Commission orders a reasonable xDSL loop interval of three or five days with conditioning."

According to witness Kinard, "the standard interval for migrations from special access to EELs should be 95 percent within ten days from receipt of an error-free request for conversion." E.spire also proposes a new submeasure that could measure how quickly BellSouth changes billing rates from special access to EELs charges. The ALECs proposed benchmark for this measure is 95 percent within 30 days from the receipt of an error-free order.

Witness Coon notes that witness Kinard simply presents her analogs and benchmarks without any critical analysis to support the conclusions she has reached. BellSouth witness Coon notes that its recommendations regarding benchmarks and analogs are a result of several years works and have been conformed to the results reached in Georgia. While BellSouth agrees with the principle that simply having another state approve something does not necessarily mean it is appropriate for Florida to approve, the fact that Georgia has approved these analogs and benchmarks should bear some weight.

DECISION

Business Rules

We analyzed the proposed BellSouth SQM as well as the specific changes requested by the ALEC Coalition. Our analysis and findings regarding the changes to the specific business rules requested by the ALEC Coalition are shown in Attachment 3.

Disaggregation

In addition to the changes to the business rules discussed above, the ALECs are requesting extensive additions to the levels of disaggregation. We agree that the measurement categories should be broken down to a level so that there are meaningful direct comparisons between performance BellSouth gives its customers and that provided to ALECs and their customers. The varying domains, such as preordering, ordering, provisioning, and maintenance and repair will have differing level of disaggregation. Below we will discuss our general opinion by domain. Attachment 4 is our

analysis of the disaggregation for each metric as proposed by BellSouth for informational purposes.

For the OSS or preordering domain, it is important that ALECs have constant access to applications and systems in a expedient manner. The metrics in the OSS domain address system response times and interface availability. We find that generally the metrics contained in this domain shall be disaggregated by legacy system or application accessed. In some cases, it will also be appropriate to capture results to preorder inquiries in time intervals. We have analyzed each level of disaggregation for the preordering domain metric as proposed by BellSouth and find that the disaggregation is generally appropriate as summarized in Attachment 4.

The purpose of the ordering metrics is to provide information to ALECs regarding the status of an order submitted to BellSouth. The majority of the ordering metrics are measuring a time interval and will be measured against benchmarks rather than retail analogs. When appropriate we find it is necessary to disaggregate by level of mechanization used to send an order. For example, an order sent over an electronic interface can be rejected in a relatively short time frame compared to an order that is sent via fax machine. For those metrics that measure a time interval, we find it appropriate to disaggregate by time frame. In some cases, when ordering metrics it is also necessary to disaggregate by product type to discern if an individual product is being discriminated against in the ordering process. We find the level of disaggregation for each of the ordering metrics specified in Attachment 4 is appropriate.

The provisioning metrics capture the amount of time it takes BellSouth to provision orders. BellSouth's proposal for provisioning metrics generally includes disaggregation by product, volume, level of mechanization and dispatch status. We find this level of disaggregation appropriate for provision metrics, as summarized in Attachment 4.

The purpose of the maintenance and repair metrics is to show a variety of activities, such as missed appointment, trouble rate, and duration of trouble reports. Generally, maintenance and repair metrics will be disaggregated by product and dispatch status. We find this level of disaggregation appropriate for this type of metric, as shown in Attachment 4.